

REMARKS

This amendment is being submitted in response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated January 2, 2008.\ and replaces the amendment filed October 22, 2007.

The amendment submitted herewith substantially corresponds to the non-entered amendment of October 22, 2007. The present amendment corrects the formal deficiencies of the amendment filed October 22, 2007 pointed out by the Examiner in the paragraph 1(c) and 4(e) (continuation of 1(c) and 4(e)).

The present amendment also amends, in the interest of compact prosecution, claims 22-23 in accordance with the /Examiner's remarks which are appreciated.

Claim 16 is (Currently amended) and claims 17, 18 and 19 are (Canceled).

Claim 21 previously (Original) is now (Currently amended).

Claims 2, 4-8, 13, 15-16 and 20-23 are in the application.

Claim 22 is directed to the connecting elements alone, as shown in Fig. 2

Claim 23 is directed to the combination of at least one base plate and vertical supports extending upwardly from the base plate. The status identifier of claim 23 remains the same, that is, “New”.

The Examiner’s intention to withdraw claims 23, 4-8 and 20 has been noted.

The claims dependent on claim 22 are claims 2, 13, 15-16 and 21. Claims 22 and 23 have been amended to more accurately describe the claimed structure. Specifically, the expression “tooth-like” has been eliminated and the claims were amended to re cite that the notches are formed by a continuous toothing, as clearly shown in the drawings and described in the specification, e.g., on page 12, lines 12-14.

The claims dependent on claim 23 are claims 4-8 and 20.

Claim 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated based on Seibold (U.S. Patent 5,435,107) has been amended to incorporate the structure of the corrugations illustrated in Fig. 2.

The claim amendments have been made separate from the amendments of the specification.

The objections to claims 1 and 4 have been noted and appropriate corrections have been made. Note claim 1 is canceled and is replaced by claim 22.

Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated based on Seibold (U.S. Patent 5,435,107).

Seibold '107 discloses a bracket for repairing an attachment of an outer façade element to an inner load-bearing element. The reference has an elongated opening 10 with transversely extending tooth-like ribs 18. A support plate 15 has an arched bearing surface 16 divided by a central web 19 which engages in the slot or opening 10.

There is no corrugation (previously beads) located laterally outwardly of the slot 10. The applicants have noted that the term “bead” originally used is also translated by “corrugation.” The specification has been amended to replace “bead” with “corrugation” which is more appropriate, particularly considering the shapes of the “corrugations” in Fig. 2.

The corrugations in claim 22 are spaced outwardly from the elongated opening so that the inner sides of the corrugations face toward the opening and form tooth-like notches. There is nothing in Seibold to suggest the corrugations as in claim 22.

In Seibold the central web 19 is engages in the slot 10, it does not suggest a corrugation spaced laterally outwardly from the elongated opening. The arched bearing surface 16 does not suggest the complementary tooth-like notches as set forth in claim 22.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the claims presently in the application are allowable and a favorable action on the application is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander Zinchuk

/s/ **Alexander Zinchuk** */s/*
Reg. No. 30,541

for David Toren
Reg. No. 19,468

Abelman, Frayne & Schwab
666 Third Avenue, 10th Floor
New York, NY 10017-5621
212-885-9383